

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 14, 22, 26, and 35 are amended, and claims 34 and 36 are canceled. Claims 1, 3-33, 35, and 37-42 are now pending in the application. (Claim 2 was previously canceled.) Applicant respectfully requests that the foregoing amendments be entered and the application reexamined and reconsidered.

As an initial matter, this Amendment should be entered because, as discussed more fully below, the Amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance. (See MPEP § 714.12.) Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 3-13, and 18-21 are allowed, and claims 37-42 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant further acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's suggestion that one or more of claims 40-42 be written into claim 14; one or more of claims 37-39 be written into claim 22; and claim 36 and one or both of claims 34 and 35 be written into claim 26. As discussed below, Applicant has done so.

That is, claim 14 has been amended to include claims 40-42 in the alternative. In other words, claim 14 now recites that "said method further [comprises] at least one of" "storing, reporting, displaying, or presenting to a user said propagation delay" (as recited in claim 40), "utilizing said propagation delay to calibrate said plurality of communications channels" (as recited in claim 41), or "outputting a signal corresponding to said propagation delay to a display device, an electronic storage device, or as a control signal" (as recited in claim 42). Applicants note that claims 40-42 have not been canceled and are not redundant because claim 14 recites the features of claims 40-42 in the alternative. For example, the scope of claim 14 can cover a method that includes the features of claim 40 but does not include the features of claim 41; the scope of claim 41, however, covers only methods that include the features of claim 41. Claim 14 and its dependent claims (claims 15-17 and 40-42) should therefore clearly be in condition for allowance.

Claim 22 has similarly been amended to include claims 37-39 in the alternative. That is, claim 22 now includes at least one of the features recited in claim 37, claim 38, or claim 39. Again, Applicants note that claims 37-39 have not been deleted because they are not redundant. Again, claim 22 and its dependent claims (claims 23-25 and 37-39) should therefore clearly be in condition for allowance.

Claim 26 has been amended to include the recitations of claims 34 and 36 as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 26 and its dependent claims (claims 27-33, and 35) should therefore clearly be in condition for allowance.

The only other claims pending in the application are claims 1, 3-13, and 18-21, which as mentioned, were identified by the Examiner as allowable. Therefore, all pending claims should clearly be in condition for allowance.

For all of the foregoing reasons, all of the rejections of the claims should be overcome, and the application should be passed to allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicant's attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (801) 323-5934.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 1, 2007

By /N. Kenneth Burraston/
N. Kenneth Burraston
Reg. No. 39,923

Kirton & McConkie
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
P.O. Box 45120
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-1004
Telephone: (801) 323-5934
Fax: (801) 321-4893